

**Remarks**

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application in view of the following remarks and amendments are respectfully requested.

Claim 1-6, 8, 10-16, and 21-26 remain pending in the present application, with claims 7, 9, and 17-20 previously canceled.

Claims 1-6, 8, and 10-16 stand allowed. Claims 21 and 23-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Great Britain Patent No. 1,499,146 (GB '146) in view of either U.S. Patent No. 3,354,576 (Gralnick '576) or U.S. Patent No. 5,865,013 (Jackson '013). Claim 22 stands objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the careful consideration and allowance of claims 1-6, 8, and 10-16. Applicant has amended claims 21 and 26 to correct minor typographical errors not related to patentability.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections of claims 21 and 26 for at least the reason that the cited combination of references do not disclose or teach each limitation of claims 21 and 26. Specifically, claim 21 recites a packaging system that includes an absorbent product in a container and a consumer message label attached to the container having a first swatch and a second swatch. The first swatch includes a first predetermined feature; the second swatch includes a second predetermined feature; and the first and second predetermined features are not identical. Claim 26 further recites that the absorbent product in the container includes the first and second predetermined features.

As correctly cited in the present office action, GB '146 discloses a package for an

absorbent product and that it is possible to place several samples on each package. However, GB '146 does not disclose or teach that the several samples may include first and second features that are not identical as recited in claim 21. Furthermore, GB '146 does not disclose or teach that the absorbent product in the container includes the first and second features as recited in claim 26.

Gralnick '576 and Jackson '013 disclose packages containing products having multiple features. However, neither Gralnick '576 nor Jackson '013 disclose the use of swatches as otherwise recited in claims 21 and 26. Therefore, neither Gralnick '576 nor Jackson '013 correct the deficiencies in GB '146, and Applicant respectfully asserts that the cited combination of GB '146 in view of either Gralnick '576 or Jackson '013 does not disclose or teach each limitation of claims 21 and 26. As a result, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection of claims 21 and 23-26.

For at least the reasons discussed above, the Applicant respectfully submits that the claims patentably define over the cited references. As such, it is believed that the present application is in complete condition for allowance and favorable action, therefore, is respectfully requested. Should any issues remain after consideration of this amendment, then Examiner Bui is invited and encouraged to telephone the undersigned at her convenience.

Respectfully submitted,

May 25, 2006



---

Steven R. LeBlanc  
Reg. No. 47,740  
DORITY & MANNING, P.A.  
P.O. Box 1449  
Greenville, SC 29602

KCX-756 (19934)

(864) 271-1592  
(864) 233-7342